



COUNCIL COMMITTEE: 12/7/10
ITEM: 10.4 a, b, c

Memorandum

**TO: HONORABLEMAYOR AND
CITY COUNCIL**

FROM: Councilmember Rose Herrera

SUBJECT: SEE BELOW

DATE: December 7, 2010

Approved

Date:

12/07/10

SUBJECT

**GENERAL PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT & GENERAL PLAN LAND
USE/TRANSPORTATION DIAGRAM AMENDMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE
EVERGREEN*EAST HILLS AREA.**

- GPT05-08-01
- GP05-08-01A (Arcadia)
- GP05-08-01B (Pleasant Hills Golf Course)
- GP05-08-01C (Campus Industrial - Berg)
- GP05-08-01D (Campus Industrial – IDS)
- GP05-08-01E (Campus Industrial – Legacy)
- GP05-08-01F (Evergreen Valley College)
- ESJ2040-006 (Campus Industrial – Berg and IDS)

RECOMMENDATION

Support the recommendation of both Planning Staff and the Planning Commission to deny the proposed General Plan Amendments.

BACKGROUND

The City Council should deny all items included in 10.4 (a), (b), and (c) because they are inactive General Plan Amendment applications and a rejection of the request for Alternate Draft Envision 2040 Land Use Designations is recommended because they are all inconsistent with the current San Jose 2020 General Plan. Furthermore, they area also inconsistent with the proposed goals and policies of the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update, including the Council-accepted “Preferred Land Use Scenario” and the City Concepts of the proposed Envision Draft Plan and/or have been the subject of subsequent General Plan Amendments for alternative land uses as explained further in this report.

As a community, we are invested in implementing the future vision of the Envision 2040 General Plan update. For Evergreen, the applications are inconsistent with the adopted Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy. These pending applications are out of date and out of sync with where

HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

December 7, 2010

Subject: 104. (a), (b), and (c)

Page 2

we are going as a city. San Jose cannot risk converting more than 400 acres of campus industrial employment land. The intent of the Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy was to severely limit the amount of new development that could be approved. Minimal additional development is appropriate in Evergreen and anything beyond what is planned for would be a huge undertaking that is not appropriate at this time.